



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,098	04/23/2004	Tomomichi Obara	1081.1201	7523
21171	7590	12/02/2008	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			VU, TUAN A	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/830,098	OBARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. VU	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-9,11,13-15,17-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-9,11,13-15,17-19,21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 9/29/08.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 14 have been amended, and claim 21. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 21 are pending in the office action.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5, 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,131,577 (hereinafter '577).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observations. Following are but a few examples as to how the certain claims from the instant invention and from the above copending application are conflicting with each other.

As per instant claim 1, '577 claim 5 also recites Web server and performing guide display, transaction operation including a display unit, a plurality of I/O units, a control unit controlling the guide display of the screen content according to object embedded in said screen

content from the Web server, wherein the control unit calls method and controls sequence of said plurality of I/O units for said method; wherein said control unit calls up a method for 'each processing controlling the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units according to the script ... synchronization of said plurality of I/O units'. '577 Claim 5 recites interpreting a applet tag of an embedded object, which might not be identical to instant claim 1 reciting of 'interpreting a script of said object embedded in said screen content ... calls up a method for each processing ... controlling synchronization'. '577 does not explicitly recite: *calls up a method for each processing of said transaction operation, said method issuing said f/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers and controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units.*

However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that '577 claim 5 does contain an obvious language variation of instant claim 2 above teaching in '577 interpreting a tag of a applet interpreting a embedded object in said screen content.

As per instant claim 11, this claim corresponds to instant claim 2, while '577 claim 12 corresponds to '577 claim 5; hence, '577 claim 12 would be an obvious variant of instant claim 11, based on the analysis as set forth above.

4. Claims 1, 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 12 of copending Patent Application No. 11,103,450 (hereinafter '450). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observations.

As per instant claim 1, '450 claim 3 also recites Web server and performing guide display, transaction operation including a display unit, a plurality of I/O units, a control unit controlling the guide display of the screen content according to object embedded in said screen

content from the Web server; wherein said control unit calls up a method for *controlling* said plurality of I/O units by the script embedded in said screen content, said unit comprising a browser which interprets said script in processing units of the operation for synchronously controlling said I/O units. Although '450 claim 3 recital of 'synchronously controls' might not be identical to the 'synchronization' of instant claim 1, i.e. *calls up a method for each processing of said transaction operation, said method issuing said f/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers and controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units*, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that '450 does contain an obvious language variation of instant claim 1 in terms of '450 claim 3's processing a embedded object of script in screen content so as to provide said *controlling* so that I/O operate synchronously.

As per instant claim 11, this claim corresponds to instant claim 1, while '450 claim 12 corresponds to '450 claim 3; hence '450 claim 12 would be an obvious variant of instant claim 11, based on the analysis as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et al, USPN: 7,025,255 (hereinafter Drummond).

As per claim 1, Drummond discloses an automatic transaction apparatus for communicating with a Web server (HTTP server – Fig. 5-6; server 134 – Fig 25) and performing guide display and a transaction operation according to an operation of a user (Fig. 25, 27-28), comprising:

a display unit for performing said guide display (e.g. screen 30 – Fig. 2-3, 23-24; Fig. 28-31 – Note: event listener on browser/user interface reads on guide display where graphical event-based activities guide the user with underlying and coordinated of object/code invocations to operate on the related interface units);

a plurality of I/O units for performing said transaction operation and comprising at least a cash processing unit, a medium handling unit, a user input unit and a card processing unit (interfaces 36 – Fig. 2-3; card reader, cash dispenser, touch screen, browser script, device in. software, keyboard depository – Fig. 5-6; Fig. 28); and

a control unit for controlling the guide display of the screen of said display unit (interface 122, 124 – Fig. 25) according to a screen content from said Web server (server 134 – Fig 25), and controlling said plurality of I/O units according to objects embedded in said screen content, wherein said control unit comprises:

a plurality of I/O controllers, each I/O controller controlling a corresponding said I/O unit according to a type of I/O command (card reader, cash dispenser, touch screen, browser script, device in. software, keyboard depository – Fig. 5-6; Fig. 28 – Note: interfaces for reading card, processing card and user key entries, dispensing cash reads on underlying I/O controllers); and

a browser which interprets (browser 84 – Fig 5-6) said screen content from said Web server (e.g. HTML documents ... HTTP server - col. 12 line 58 to col. 13, line 21) and performs said guide display (col. 13 line 56 to col. 14, line 2; col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3), and interprets a script of said object embedded in said screen content (col. 12 li. 58-64; col. 45 li. 20-43) and

calls up a method for each processing of said transaction operation, said method issuing said f/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers (e.g. *processes documents ... coordinate locations ... function keys ... by pressing ... as determined by selected mapsets* - col. 44 lines 6-25; Fig. 31) and controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units (e.g. manager class 180 ... invokes print URL method ... reads data function ... invokes delivery method - col. 44 line 61 to col. 62 line 61 – Note: *manager class* to initiate sequences of method invocations based on content of HTML server documents reads on synchronization by invoking method for fulfilling operations until a receipt is delivered – see *sync object 284* – Fig. 52).

As per claim 3, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit transmits a request to said Web server according to a post request (col. 37 lines 3-18; *script ... backstage applet ... make requests .. available servers* - col. 38 lines 64 to col. 39, line 42; Fig. 5; col. 13, lines 40-51; col. 14, lines 3-10) by said called up method.

As per claim 4, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit receives a screen content which has a screen creation program described by a page description language (e.g. col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; col. 13 lines 56-65), a script of said object, and a method program called up by said script (e.g. *HTML document ... embedded Java script... Java applet* -- col. 13 lines 56-65).

As per claim 5, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit issues an operation command (e.g. col. 13, line 65 to col. 14 line 2) to said plurality of I/O units by said called up method (e.g. embedded Java applet - col. 13 lines 56-65; refer to claim 1), and receives a reply from said I/O units (e.g. *embedded Java script instructions ... cause dispense of currency* - Fig. 11; Fig. 31 and related text).

As per claim 7, Drummond discloses wherein said control unit specifies said plurality of I/O units for which synchronization is controlled by said method according to input parameters (e.g. *HTML document ... address data and/or other parameters* - col. 26, lines 27-41; *. embedded Java script instructions ... cause dispense of currency* - Fig. 11 and related text – Note: instructions prompting user to enter PIN or to get dispensed currency reads on specifying which I/O unit under control by the underlying embedded Java Script calls) attached to said script.

As per claim 8, Drummond discloses wherein said browser creates said guide screen by a screen creation program described by a page description language (col. 20, line 55 to col. 21 line 3; col. 13 lines 56-65) of said screen content, calls up said method program from the script of said object (e.g. *HTML document ... embedded Java script... Java applet* -- col. 13 lines 56-65), and controls the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units (Fig. 11).

As per claim 9, Drummond discloses wherein said browser creates said guide screen by a screen creation program described by the page description language of said screen content (e.g. col. 28 line 47 to col. 29, line 5 – Note: scenario including repetitive processing of server-sent documents/pages for a foreign currency request with underlying applet invocations reads on screen by screen creation program described by received pages), calls up a method program of an

applet from said applet specification (e.g. *HTML document ... embedded Java script... Java applet* -- col. 13 lines 56-65; col. 27, lines 45-48) and method specification of the script of said object, and controls the synchronization of said plurality of I/O units (refer to claim 5).

As per claim 11, Drummond discloses an automatic transaction system comprising: a Web server; and

an automatic transaction apparatus which is connected to said web Server via a network for communicating with said Web server and performing guide display and a transaction operation according to an operation of a user,

wherein said automatic transaction apparatus comprises: a display unit for performing said guide display;

a plurality of I/O units for performing said transaction operation and comprising at least a cash processing unit, a medium handling unit, a user input unit and a card processing unit; and

a control unit for controlling the guide display of the screen of said display unit according to a screen content from said Web server, and controlling said plurality of I/O units according to objects embedded in said screen content, wherein said control unit comprises:

a plurality of I/O controllers, each I/O controller controlling a corresponding said I/O unit according to a type of I/O command; and

a browser which interprets said screen content from said Web server and performs said guide display, and interprets a script of said object embedded in said screen content and calls up a method for each processing of said transaction operation, said method issuing said I/O

command to said plurality of I/O controllers and controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units;

all of which having been addressed in claim 1.

As per claims 13-15, 17-19, these claims correspond to claims 3-5, 7-9, respectively, hence will incorporate the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claim 21, Drummond discloses an ATM user interface display method, comprising:

interpreting ATM operations utilized by a first ATM connected to a web server (Fig. 5-6; col. 44 line 61 to col. 62 line 61; col. 12 line 58 to col. 13, line 21);

synchronizing the ATM operations utilized by the first ATM with a common set of ATM operations (col. 13 line 56 to col. 14, line 13; Fig. 31 and related text; see sync object 284 - Fig. 52); and

displaying a generalized user interface based on the common set of ATM operations on a second ATM connected to the web server (ATMs 12 – col. 8 lines 2-14; col. 12 lines 22-45 –

Note: home server in communications with plurality of ATMs with script loaded from delivered documents within the server-managed intranet reads on displaying at each such ATM a common set of ATM operations – see Fig. 5-6, 27-30 - in any second ATM of such intranet - see col. 12 line 54 to col. 13 line 22).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observation in regard thereto.

USC § 102 Rejection:

(A) Applicants have submitted that nothing in Drummond as cited discloses 'said method issuing said I/O command to said plurality of I/O controllers ... synchronization ... of I/O units'" (Appl. Rmrks pg. 7 bottom). The argument relates to a new claim limitation, hence is clearly moot in light of the present rejection which has been adjusted to meet the amendments including such added limitation.

(B) Applicants have submitted that Drummond fails to disclose 'plurality of I/O controllers ... according to a type of I/O command' (Appl. Rmrks pg. 8 top). The argument is not commensurate with the previous Office Action, hence would be moot as set forth in section A. Further, there is nothing specific about 'type of I/O' to preclude a I/O related directives from Drummond interface --based on a event to redirect to a object or underlying API - for invoking a corresponding call to I/O interfaces (messaging, printing, receiving key inputs, delivering a receipt, dispensing cash – see Fig 5-6) from meeting the language 'according to the type of I/O" with type being each of the I/O operations as set forth as common feature in Drummond's typical ATM.

In all, the claims as amended has necessitated another form of rejections, and the arguments are mostly moot in light of the above; the claims stand rejected as set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571)272-3759.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan A Vu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193

November 25, 2008